

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 1, 19 and 37 without prejudice. Claims 2-18, 20-36 and 38-54 are pending. Claims 2-4, 9-10, 13-18, 20-22, 28, 32-33, 35-36, 38-40, 45-46 and 49-54 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Claims 3-13, 21-31 and 39-49 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of Claims 3-13, 21-31 and 39-49.

112 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 2, 20 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because these claims contain subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. Applicants respectfully note that the instant specification addresses “without decoding” specifically at line 7 on page 22 and generally in the discussion that follows, particularly the discussion of Figures 18A-18E and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 2, 20 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is traversed.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 2, 14-18, 20, 32-36, 38 and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article “An Active Router architecture for Multicast Video Distribution” by Keller et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,257 to Benayoun et al.

Claim 3 has been amended herein to incorporate the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, and hence is in condition for allowance as mentioned above. Claims 2, 14-18 and 20 are dependent on Claim 3 and therefore are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 21 has been amended herein to incorporate the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, and hence is in condition for allowance as mentioned above. Claims 32-36 and 38 are dependent on Claim 21 and therefore are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 39 has been amended herein to incorporate the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, and hence is in condition for allowance as mentioned above. Claims 50-54 are dependent on Claim 39 and therefore are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Therefore, a discussion of the rejection of Claims 2, 14-18, 20, 32-36, 38 and 50-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is rendered moot at this time.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 2-18, 20-36 and 38-54 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 9/27/05

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060